

# Directional Differentiability of Metric Projections onto Moving Sets at Boundary Points

ALEXANDER SHAPIRO

*Department of Mathematics and Applied Mathematics,  
University of South Africa, P.O. Box 392, Pretoria, 0001 South Africa*

*Submitted by Frank H. Clarke*

*Received February 11, 1986*

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Let  $X, Y$  be finite dimensional normed spaces and  $\Omega: X \rightrightarrows Y$  be a multifunction assigning to each  $x \in X$  a closed set  $\Omega(x) \subset Y$ . With  $\Omega(x)$  are associated the distance function  $d_\Omega: X \times Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and the set-valued metric projection  $\Pi_\Omega: X \times Y \rightrightarrows Y$ , which are defined as

$$d_\Omega(x, y) = \inf\{\|y - v\| : v \in \Omega(x)\}$$

and

$$\Pi_\Omega(x, y) = \{v \in \Omega(x) : \|y - v\| = d_\Omega(x, y)\},$$

respectively. The aim of this paper is to investigate differential properties of  $\Pi_\Omega$  in the vicinity of a point  $(x_0, y_0)$  with  $y_0$  being a boundary point of the set  $\Omega(x_0)$ . We study  $\Pi_\Omega$  in terms of a corresponding selection mapping  $P_\Omega: X \times Y \rightarrow Y$ , that is  $P_\Omega(x, y) \in \Pi_\Omega(x, y)$  so that  $v = P_\Omega(x, y)$  is a nearest to  $y$  point of  $\Omega(x)$ . It should be mentioned that since  $y_0 \in \Omega(x_0)$ , the set  $\Pi_\Omega(x_0, y_0) = \{y_0\}$  is a singleton and hence  $P_\Omega$  is uniquely defined at  $(x_0, y_0)$  with  $P_\Omega(x_0, y_0) = y_0$ .

In the case  $\Omega(x) = \Omega_0$  is a constant (independent of  $x$ ) nonempty convex set, differentiability properties of metric projections have been studied in a number of publications (see, e.g., [4–7, 17] and references therein). It was shown that if, in addition, the corresponding norm is strictly convex, then  $P_\Omega$  is directionally differentiable at every point  $y_0 \in \Omega_0$  [5, 11, 17]. The situation of moving set  $\Omega(x)$  has been discussed in [9]. There differentiability of  $P_\Omega$  has been investigated (by applying sensitivity analysis of nonlinear programs [3, 8]) essentially at a point  $y_0$  outside the set  $\Omega(x_0)$ . In this paper we extend some results from [16], where necessary and in a sense sufficient conditions for directional differentiability of  $P_\Omega$  at  $y_0 \in \Omega_0$

have been given for constant  $\Omega(x) = \Omega_0$ . Such an extension became possible owing to recent developments in the theory of point-to-set mappings. In particular, we make use of the concept of *pseudo-Lipschitzian* multifunctions [1, 15].

We suppose throughout that for a given point  $x_0$  the set  $\Omega(x_0)$  is non-empty and  $y_0 \in \Omega(x_0)$ . It will be shown that directional differentiability of  $P_\Omega$  at  $(x_0, y_0)$  is determined by local behavior of the multifunction  $\Omega$  and depends little on the chosen norm in  $Y$ . Assuming that  $\Omega$  is pseudo-Lipschitzian we give in Section 2 necessary and sufficient conditions for the distance function  $d_\Omega(x, y)$  to be directionally differentiable at  $(x_0, y_0)$ . This will provide us with a basis for investigating differentiability properties of  $P_\Omega$  in Section 3.

For a multifunction  $\Omega$  we write  $\text{gph } \Omega$  for its graph,

$$\text{gph } \Omega = \{(x, y): y \in \Omega(x)\}.$$

The multifunction  $\Omega$  is called closed (convex) if  $\text{gph } \Omega$  is a closed (convex) subset of  $X \times Y$ . (We use the norm  $\|(x, y)\| = \|x\| + \|y\|$  on the product space  $X \times Y$ .) A multifunction  $\Sigma: X \rightrightarrows Y$  is said to be positively homogeneous if  $\Sigma(tx) = t\Sigma(x)$  for all  $t > 0$  and  $x \in X$ . Clearly  $\Sigma$  is positively homogeneous if and only if its graph  $\text{gph } \Sigma$  is a cone. A (closed, convex) positively homogeneous multifunction is called a (closed, convex) *process* (cf. [14, Section 39]).

By  $\text{dist}(y, S)$  we denote the distance from a point  $y$  to set  $S$ ,

$$\text{dist}(y, S) = \inf\{\|y - v\|: v \in S\}.$$

Finally, a function  $f(x)$  is said to be directionally differentiable at  $x_0$  if the directional derivative

$$f'(x_0; y) = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{f(x_0 + ty) - f(x_0)}{t}$$

exists for all  $y$ .

## 2. DIRECTIONAL DIFFERENTIABILITY OF THE DISTANCE FUNCTION

As a first step in our investigation we study differential properties of the distance function  $d_\Omega$ . By convention  $d_\Omega(x, y)$  is  $\infty$  if the set  $\Omega(x)$  is empty. Of course, for an arbitrary multifunction the associated distance function can behave quite irregularly. Therefore we restrict ourselves to multifunctions satisfying the pseudo-Lipschitzian condition which is defined as follows. Let us denote by  $\delta(A; B)$  the deviation of a set  $A$  from set  $B$ ,

$$\delta(A; B) = \sup\{\text{dist}(y, B): y \in A\}.$$

The multifunction  $\Omega(x)$  is called *pseudo-Lipschitzian* at  $(x_0, y_0)$  if there exist neighbourhoods  $N_x$  of  $x_0$ ,  $N_y$  of  $y_0$  and a positive constant  $K$  such that

$$\delta(\Omega(x_1) \cap N_y; \Omega(x_2)) \leq K \|x_1 - x_2\|$$

for all  $x_1, x_2 \in N_x$  (Aubin [1, p. 98]). The following result due to Rockafellar [15, Theorem 2.3] shows a natural interrelation between the above concept and continuity properties of  $d_\Omega$ .

**PROPOSITION 2.1.** *The multifunction  $\Omega(x)$  is pseudo-Lipschitzian at  $(x_0, y_0)$  if and only if the distance function  $d_\Omega$  is Lipschitzian in a neighborhood of  $(x_0, y_0)$ .*

In particular, the result above implies that if  $\Omega(x)$  is pseudo-Lipschitzian at  $(x_0, y_0)$ , then it is nonempty valued for all  $x$  in a neighborhood of  $x_0$ .

Now we introduce the following concept of cone approximation which will play an essential role in our considerations.

**DEFINITION 1.** We say that a subset  $S$  of a normed space is approximated at  $z_0 \in S$  by a closed cone  $C$ , called an approximating cone, if

$$\lim_{\substack{z \rightarrow z_0 \\ z \in S}} \frac{\text{dist}(z - z_0, C)}{\|z - z_0\|} = 0 \quad (2.1)$$

and

$$\lim_{\substack{z \rightarrow z_0 \\ z - z_0 \in C}} \frac{\text{dist}(z, S)}{\|z - z_0\|} = 0. \quad (2.2)$$

The set  $S - z_0$  and the approximating cone  $C$  are *tangent* (at zero) in the sense of Robinson [13, Definition 3]. A discussion of similar concepts and relevant references can be found in [12, Section 4].

It was shown in [16] that, in the finite-dimensional case, the approximating cone  $C$  exists if and only if the distance function  $d_S(z) = \text{dist}(z, S)$  is directionally differentiable at  $z_0$ , in which case  $d'_S(z_0; v) = \text{dist}(v, C)$ . This implies that

$$C = \{v: d'_S(z_0; v) = 0\}$$

and hence once the approximating cone exists it is unique. These results settle the problem for constant multifunction  $\Omega$ . In the following definition we extend the above concept of cone approximation by approximating  $\Omega$  with a closed (not necessarily convex) process  $\bar{\Sigma}$ .

DEFINITION 2. We say that  $\Omega$  is tangentially differentiable at  $(x_0, y_0) \in \text{gph } \Omega$  if there exists a closed process  $\Sigma: X \rightrightarrows Y$  such that

$$\lim_{\substack{(x, y) \rightarrow (x_0, y_0) \\ (x, y) \in \text{gph } \Omega}} \frac{\text{dist}(y - y_0, \Sigma(x - x_0))}{\|(x - x_0, y - y_0)\|} = 0 \quad (2.3)$$

and

$$\lim_{\substack{(x, y) \rightarrow (x_0, y_0) \\ (x - x_0, y - y_0) \in \text{gph } \Sigma}} \frac{\text{dist}(y, \Omega(x))}{\|(x - x_0, y - y_0)\|} = 0. \quad (2.4)$$

The process  $\Sigma$  is said to be a tangential approximation to  $\Omega$  at  $(x_0, y_0)$  and is denoted  $\Sigma = D\Omega(x_0, y_0)$ .

Fixing  $x = x_0$  in (2.3) and (2.4) one obtains that the set  $\Omega(x_0)$  is approximated at  $y_0$  by the cone  $\Sigma(0)$ . Furthermore, we have that

$$\text{dist}(y, \Omega(x)) = \text{dist}((x, y), \{x\} \times \Omega(x)),$$

and since  $\{x\} \times \Omega(x)$  is a subset of  $\text{gph } \Omega$  it follows that

$$\text{dist}(y, \Omega(x)) \geq \text{dist}((x, y), \text{gph } \Omega).$$

Therefore condition (2.4) implies (2.2) for  $z_0 = (x_0, y_0)$ ,  $S = \text{gph } \Omega$  and  $C = \text{gph } \Sigma$ . Similarly, (2.1) follows from (2.3). Consequently if the tangential approximation  $\Sigma$  exists, then the set  $\text{gph } \Omega$  is approximated at  $(x_0, y_0)$  by the cone  $\text{gph } \Sigma$ . It may be noted that when it exists, the approximating cone coincides with the contingent (Bouligand) cone. Therefore for a *tangentially differentiable* multifunction  $\Omega$ ,  $D\Omega(x_0, y_0)$  is equal to the "contingent derivative" introduced by Aubin [1, Definition 1].

The following example demonstrates that, in general, existence of cone approximation  $C$  to  $\text{gph } \Omega$  does not guarantee that the corresponding process  $\Sigma$  is the tangential approximation to  $\Omega$ .

EXAMPLE. Let  $f(x)$  be a piecewise linear function (of real variable) defined as follows. Consider numbers  $a_k = k^{-1} - 2^{-k}$ ,  $b_k = k^{-1} + 2^{-k}$  and let  $f(x) = k^{-1} 2^k \min\{|x - a_k|, |x - b_k|\}$  for  $x \in [a_k, b_k]$ ,  $k = 6, 7, \dots$ , and  $f(x)$  be zero otherwise. Consider the associated multifunction  $\Omega: \mathbb{R} \rightrightarrows \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\Omega(x) = \{y: y \geq f(x)\}$ , i.e.,  $\text{gph } \Omega$  is the epigraph of  $f$ . It can be verified that the distance function corresponding to  $\text{gph } \Omega$  is directionally differentiable at  $(0, 0)$  and hence the approximating cone exists and is given by  $C = \{(x, y): y \geq 0\}$ . However, the process  $\Sigma$ , with  $\text{gph } \Sigma = C$ , is not tangent to  $\Omega$  at  $(0, 0)$ .

A reason why the process  $\Sigma$  in the example above failed to provide the tangential approximation is that  $\Omega$  was not pseudo-Lipschitzian. As we shall see later this does not happen for pseudo-Lipschitzian multifunctions.

Tangential differentiability of a multifunction is a natural generalization of the concept of directional differentiability. The following proposition makes this explicit.

**PROPOSITION 2.2.** *Let  $\omega: X \rightarrow Y$  be a locally Lipschitz mapping. Then the corresponding (single-valued) multifunction  $\Omega(x) = \{\omega(x)\}$  is tangentially differentiable at  $(x_0, y_0)$ ,  $y_0 = \omega(x_0)$ , if and only if  $\omega$  is directionally differentiable at  $x_0$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose that  $\omega$  is directionally differentiable at  $x_0$ . Then since  $\omega$  is locally Lipschitz,

$$\omega(x_0 + v) - \omega(x_0) = \omega'(x_0; v) + o(\|v\|)$$

(e.g., [2, Lemma 3.2]). Now it can be easily seen that (2.3) and (2.4) hold for  $\Sigma(v) = \{\omega'(x_0; v)\}$ . Consequently,  $\Omega$  is tangentially differentiable at  $(x_0, y_0)$ .

On the other hand, suppose that  $\Omega$  is tangentially differentiable at  $(x_0, y_0)$ . Since  $\Omega(x)$  is single-valued it follows from (2.4) that the tangential approximation  $\Sigma(v)$  is also single-valued, say  $\Sigma(v) = \{\sigma(v)\}$ . From (2.3) we obtain

$$\omega(x_0 + v) - \omega(x_0) = \sigma(v) + o(\|(v, y - y_0)\|),$$

where  $y = \omega(x)$ . Since  $\omega$  is locally Lipschitz this implies that

$$\omega(x_0 + v) - \omega(x_0) = \sigma(v) + o(\|v\|)$$

and the proof is complete. ■

Now we formulate the main result of this section.

**THEOREM 2.3.** *Suppose that  $\Omega$  is pseudo-Lipschitzian at  $(x_0, y_0)$ . Then the following statements are equivalent:*

- (i) *The set  $\text{gph } \Omega$  is approximated at  $(x_0, y_0)$  by a closed cone  $C$ .*
- (ii) *The multifunction  $\Omega$  is tangentially differentiable at  $(x_0, y_0)$ .*
- (iii) *The distance function  $d_\Omega$  is directionally differentiable at  $(x_0, y_0)$ .*

*Proof.* Without loss of generality we can assume that  $(x_0, y_0) = (0, 0)$ . Suppose that condition (i) holds and consider the process  $\Sigma$  corresponding to the cone  $C$ , i.e.,  $\text{gph } \Sigma = C$ . We show that  $\Sigma$  gives the tangential approximation to  $\Omega$  at  $(x_0, y_0)$ .

First let us prove that the multifunction  $\Sigma$  is Lipschitzian. Let  $x_1, x_2 \in X$ ,  $x_2 \neq 0$ , and  $y_1 \in \Sigma(x_1)$ . It follows from (2.2) that for all  $t > 0$  there exists a vector  $(\bar{x}_1(t), \bar{y}_1(t)) \in \text{gph } \Omega$  such that

$$\|(tx_1, ty_1) - (\bar{x}_1(t), \bar{y}_1(t))\| = o(t). \quad (2.4)$$

Since  $\Omega$  is pseudo-Lipschitzian we have that for sufficiently small  $t$  there is  $y_2^*(t) \in \Omega(tx_2)$  such that

$$\|\bar{y}_1(t) - y_2^*(t)\| \leq K \|\bar{x}_1(t) - tx_2\|. \quad (2.5)$$

Furthermore, by (2.1) we can find  $(\bar{x}_2(t), \bar{y}_2(t)) \in C$  such that

$$\|(tx_2, y_2^*(t)) - (\bar{x}_2(t), \bar{y}_2(t))\| = o(t). \quad (2.6)$$

Conditions (2.4)–(2.6) imply that

$$\|ty_1 - \bar{y}_2(t)\| \leq Kt \|x_1 - x_2\| + o(t) \quad (2.7)$$

and

$$\|tx_2 - \bar{x}_2(t)\| = o(t). \quad (2.8)$$

By the standard argument of compactness there exists a sequence  $\{t_n\} \downarrow 0$  such that  $t_n^{-1}\bar{y}_2(t_n)$  converges to a vector  $y_2$ . Also it follows from (2.8) that  $t_n^{-1}\bar{x}_2(t_n) \rightarrow x_2$ . Then since  $C$  is closed,  $(x_2, y_2) \in C$ . It only remains to note that because of (2.7)

$$\|y_1 - y_2\| \leq K \|x_1 - x_2\|.$$

Since  $x_1, x_2$  and  $y_1 \in \Sigma(x_1)$  are arbitrary this shows that the multifunction  $\Sigma$  is Lipschitzian. Of course, Lipschitz continuity of  $\Sigma$  implies that  $\Sigma(x)$  is nonempty-valued for all  $x$  (cf. [1, Proposition 1]).

Now let us show that condition (2.3) holds. Consider a point  $z = (x, y) \in \text{gph } \Omega$ . We have from (2.2) that there exists a point  $\bar{z} = (\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \in \text{gph } \Sigma$  such that  $\|z - \bar{z}\| = o(\|z\|)$ . Since  $\Sigma$  is Lipschitzian, there exists  $y^* \in \Sigma(x)$  such that  $\|y^* - \bar{y}\| \leq K \|x - \bar{x}\|$ . This implies that  $\|y - y^*\| = o(\|z\|)$  and hence (2.3) follows. Condition (2.4) can be proved in a similar way by using pseudo-Lipschitzian continuity of  $\Omega$ . This completes the proof of the implication (i)  $\Rightarrow$  (ii).

Now suppose that condition (ii) holds and let  $\Sigma = D\Omega(x_0, y_0)$ . It follows from the proof above that  $\Sigma$  is Lipschitzian. Since  $\Sigma$  is positively homogeneous the distance function

$$d_\Sigma(x, y) = \text{dist}(y, \Sigma(x))$$

is also positively homogeneous. Therefore in order to prove that  $d_\Omega$  is directionally differentiable it will be sufficient to show that

$$d_\Omega(x, y) = d_\Sigma(x, y) + o(\|(x, y)\|). \quad (2.9)$$

We have that  $d_\Omega(x, y) = \|y - P_\Omega(x, y)\|$  and since  $d_\Omega$  is Lipschitzian near  $(0, 0)$ , there exists a positive constant  $K$  such that

$$\|y - P_\Omega(x, y)\| \leq K \|(x, y)\|$$

for all  $(x, y)$  in a neighborhood of  $(0, 0)$ . Consequently,

$$\|P_\Omega(x, y)\| \leq K \|(x, y)\| + \|y\|$$

and hence

$$\|P_\Omega(x, y)\| \leq 2K \|(x, y)\|. \quad (2.10)$$

It follows from (2.3) that for every point  $(x, y)$  there exists a point  $y^* = y^*(x, y) \in \Sigma(x)$  such that

$$\|P_\Omega(x, y) - y^*\| = o(\|(x, P_\Omega(x, y))\|).$$

By (2.10) we obtain that

$$\|P_\Omega(x, y) - y^*\| = o(\|(x, y)\|). \quad (2.11)$$

Now we have

$$d_\Sigma(x, y) \leq \|y - y^*\| \leq \|y - P_\Omega(x, y)\| + \|P_\Omega(x, y) - y^*\|.$$

Since  $\|y - P_\Omega(x, y)\| = d_\Omega(x, y)$  and by (2.11) the last inequality implies that

$$d_\Sigma(x, y) \leq d_\Omega(x, y) + o(\|(x, y)\|).$$

The other inequality

$$d_\Omega(x, y) \leq d_\Sigma(x, y) + o(\|(x, y)\|)$$

can be proved in a similar way using Lipschitzian continuity of  $\Sigma$ . This proves the implication (ii)  $\Rightarrow$  (iii).

Finally suppose that  $d_\Omega$  is directionally differentiable at  $(0, 0)$ . Then since  $d_\Omega$  is Lipschitzian near  $(0, 0)$ , the directional derivative  $\alpha(x, y) = d'_\Omega((0, 0); (x, y))$  is Lipschitzian on  $X \times Y$  and

$$d_\Omega(x, y) = \alpha(x, y) + o(\|(x, y)\|). \quad (2.12)$$

Let us define the cone  $C$ ,

$$C = \{(x, y): \alpha(x, y) = 0\}.$$

Since  $\alpha$  is Lipschitzian and hence continuous, the cone  $C$  is closed. We show that  $C$  is the approximating cone of the set  $S = \text{gph } \Omega$ . Consider a point  $(x, y) \in C$ . By the definition of  $C$  and (2.12) we have  $d_\Omega(x, y) = o(\|(x, y)\|)$ . Since  $d_\Omega(x, y) \geq \text{dist}((x, y), S)$ , condition (2.2) follows. Now consider the distance function

$$d_C(x, y) = \text{dist}((x, y), C).$$

In order to prove (2.1) we have to show that for an arbitrary sequence  $\{(x_n, y_n)\} \subset S$ ,  $t_n^{-1}d_C(x_n, y_n)$  tends to zero as  $t_n = \|(x_n, y_n)\| \rightarrow 0$ . By the argument of compactness we can assume that  $t_n^{-1}(x_n, y_n)$  converges to a vector  $(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$ . Since  $(x_n, y_n) \in \text{gph } \Omega$  we have that  $d_\Omega(x_n, y_n) = 0$  and hence, by (2.12),  $t_n^{-1}\alpha(x_n, y_n)$  tends to zero. Since  $\alpha$  is positively homogeneous and continuous this implies that  $\alpha(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) = 0$ . Consequently  $(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \in C$  and thus  $d_C(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) = 0$ . Furthermore,

$$t_n^{-1}d_C(x_n, y_n) = d_C(t_n^{-1}x_n, t_n^{-1}y_n)$$

which by continuity of  $d_C$  implies that

$$t_n^{-1}d_C(x_n, y_n) \rightarrow d_C(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) = 0. \quad \blacksquare$$

It follows from the proof of Theorem 2.3 that if  $\Omega$  is pseudo-Lipschitzian and tangentially differentiable at  $(x_0, y_0)$ , then the process  $\Sigma = D\Omega(x_0, y_0)$  is Lipschitzian and the directional derivatives of  $d_\Omega$  are given by

$$d'_\Omega((x_0, y_0); (u, v)) = \text{dist}(v, \Sigma(u)). \quad (2.13)$$

Now let  $\Omega(x) = \Omega_0$  be constant. Then the distance function  $d_\Omega$  is independent of  $x$  and is directionally differentiable at  $y_0 \in \Omega_0$  if and only if there exists the approximating cone  $\Sigma_0$  to  $\Omega_0$  at  $y_0$  (see [16, Theorem 1]). Therefore in this case  $\Omega$  is tangentially differentiable at  $(x_0, y_0)$ , and  $D\Omega(x_0, y_0) \equiv \Sigma_0$ , if and only if the approximating cone  $\Sigma_0$  exists.

One can find a thorough discussion of pseudo-Lipschitzian continuity in Rockafellar [15]. Some existence results for cone approximation are given in Robinson [13, Corollary 2] and Shapiro [16, Section 3]. Combined with Theorem 2.3 this provides sufficient conditions for directional differentiability of  $d_\Omega$  for various constructions of  $\Omega$ . The subject will be discussed further in the next section.



### 3. DIRECTIONAL DIFFERENTIABILITY OF METRIC PROJECTIONS

Consider a multifunction  $\Omega(x)$  and let  $P_\Omega$  be a corresponding selection metric projection. Suppose that  $\Omega$  is tangentially differentiable at  $(x_0, y_0) \in \text{gph } \Omega$  and  $\Sigma = D\Omega(x_0, y_0)$ . Let us consider the associated point-to-set metric projection  $\Pi_\Sigma: X \times Y \rightrightarrows Y$ ,

$$\Pi_\Sigma(x, y) = \{v \in \Sigma(x): \|y - v\| = \text{dist}(y, \Sigma(x))\}.$$

Since  $\Sigma$  is positively homogeneous,  $\Pi_\Sigma$  also is. In the following theorem we give, in a sense, sufficient and necessary conditions for directional differentiability of  $P_\Omega$ .

**THEOREM 3.1.** *Suppose that  $\Omega$  is pseudo-Lipschitzian and tangentially differentiable at  $(x_0, y_0)$ . Then*

$$\lim_{\substack{t \rightarrow 0^+ \\ (u', v') \rightarrow (u, v)}} \frac{\text{dist}(P_\Omega(x_0 + tu', y_0 + tv') - y_0, t\Pi_\Sigma(u, v))}{t} = 0 \quad (3.1)$$

for all  $(u, v)$ . Conversely, if  $P_\Omega$  is Lipschitzian near  $(x_0, y_0)$  and is directionally differentiable, then  $\Omega$  is pseudo-Lipschitzian and tangentially differentiable.

*Proof.* Without loss of generality we can assume that  $(x_0, y_0) = (0, 0)$ . Let  $\Omega$  be pseudo-Lipschitzian and  $\Sigma = D\Omega(x_0, y_0)$ . Then as we have shown in the proof of Theorem 2.3 there exists a positive constant  $M$  such that

$$\|P_\Omega(x, y)\| \leq M \|(x, y)\| \quad (3.2)$$

for all  $(x, y)$  in a neighborhood of  $(0, 0)$ . We have that  $\Pi_\Sigma(0, 0) = \{0\}$  and hence for  $(u, v) = (0, 0)$  the identity (3.1) follows from (3.2). Therefore we suppose subsequently that  $(u, v) \neq (0, 0)$ . Consider a sequence  $\{(u_n, v_n)\}$  converging to  $(u, v)$  and  $t_n \rightarrow 0^+$ . It follows from (3.2) that the sequence  $\{t_n^{-1}P_n\}$ , with  $P_n = P_\Omega(t_n u_n, t_n v_n)$ , is bounded and hence by the argument of compactness we can assume that this sequence converges to a vector  $\bar{v}$ . Since the distance function  $\text{dist}(\cdot, \Pi_\Sigma(u, v))$  is continuous it follows that

$$t_n^{-1} \text{dist}(P_n, t_n \Pi_\Sigma(u, v)) \rightarrow \text{dist}(\bar{v}, \Pi_\Sigma(u, v)). \quad (3.3)$$

Furthermore, by the definition of  $\Sigma$ , i.e., condition (2.3), there exists  $v_n^* \in \Sigma(t_n u_n)$  such that  $\|P_n - v_n^*\| = o(t_n)$ . It follows that  $t_n^{-1}v_n^* \rightarrow \bar{v}$  and since  $\Sigma$  is closed we obtain that  $\bar{v} \in \Sigma(u)$ . Now we have from Theorem 2.3 that

$$\text{dist}(y, \Omega(x)) = \text{dist}(y, \Sigma(x)) + o(\|(x, y)\|).$$

Consequently,

$$\|t_n v_n - P_n\| = \text{dist}(t_n v_n, \Sigma(t_n u_n)) + o(t_n). \quad (3.4)$$

Since the function  $d_\Sigma$  is positively homogeneous and continuous we obtain from (3.4) that

$$\|v - \bar{v}\| = \text{dist}(v, \Sigma(u)).$$

Together with  $\bar{v} \in \Sigma(u)$  this implies that  $\bar{v} \in \Pi_\Sigma(u, v)$ . Therefore the left side expression in (3.3) tends to zero and thus (3.1) follows.

Conversely, if  $P_\Omega$  is Lipschitzian near  $(x_0, y_0)$ , then  $d_\Omega$  is also Lipschitzian and hence  $\Omega$  is pseudo-Lipschitzian by Proposition 2.1. Moreover, directional differentiability of  $P_\Omega$  implies directional differentiability of  $d_\Omega$  and consequently  $\Omega$  is tangentially differentiable by Theorem 2.3. ■

It follows from (3.1) that if conditions of the first part of Theorem 3.1 hold and the set  $\Pi_\Sigma(u, v) = \{z\}$  is a singleton for some  $(u, v)$ , then for  $t > 0$ ,

$$P_\Omega(x_0 + tu, y_0 + tv) = y_0 + tz + o(t). \quad (3.5)$$

Thus  $z$  is the directional derivative of  $P_\Omega$  in the direction  $(u, v)$ . Moreover, if  $\Pi_\Sigma(x, y) = \{P_\Sigma(x, y)\}$  is single-valued for all  $(x, y)$ , then (3.1) gives the directional derivative uniformly in  $(u, v)$ , i.e.,

$$P_\Omega(x_0 + u, y_0 + v) = y_0 + P_\Sigma(u, v) + o(\|(u, v)\|). \quad (3.6)$$

Suppose that the multifunction  $\Omega$  is convex. Then the distance function  $d_\Omega$  is convex and hence is locally Lipschitz (e.g., [14, p. 86]). Consequently,  $\Omega$  is pseudo-Lipschitzian by Proposition 2.1. Moreover, since  $S = \text{gph } \Omega$  is convex it has the approximating cone which is given by the tangent cone

$$C = cl \cup \{\lambda(S - z_0) : \lambda > 0\},$$

where  $z_0 = (x_0, y_0) \in S$  (cf. [16]). It follows then from Theorem 2.3 that  $\Omega$  is tangentially differentiable and  $\Sigma = D\Omega(x_0, y_0)$  is a convex process determined by  $\text{gph } \Sigma = C$ . If, in addition, the norm is strictly convex, then the metric projections  $P_\Omega$  and  $P_\Sigma$  are uniquely defined. Consequently, in this case Theorem 3.1 implies the following corollary which is an extension of the corresponding result for constant multifunction  $\Omega(x) = \Omega_0$  and convex  $\Omega_0$  [5, 11, 17].

**COROLLARY 3.2.** *Suppose that the multifunction  $\Omega$  is convex and the norm is strictly convex. Then  $P_\Omega$  is directionally differentiable and equality (3.6) holds.*

Now let us consider an important case where  $\Omega$  is defined by constraints

$$\Omega(x) = \{y: g_i(x, y) = 0, i = 1, \dots, q; g_i(x, y) \leq 0, i = q + 1, \dots, p\}.$$

Suppose that the constraint functions  $g_i$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, p$ , are  $C^1$ -smooth on  $X \times Y$  and that the Mangasarian–Fromovitz condition [10] holds at  $(x_0, y_0)$ :

(i) The gradient vectors  $\nabla_y g_i(x_0, y_0)$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, q$ , are linearly independent.

(ii) There exists a vector  $b$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} b^T \nabla_y g_i(x_0, y_0) &= 0, & i = 1, \dots, q, \\ b^T \nabla_y g_i(x_0, y_0) &< 0, & i \in I, \end{aligned}$$

where  $I = \{j: g_j(x_0, y_0) = 0, q + 1 \leq j \leq p\}$ .

Then it was shown in [15, p. 875] that  $\Omega$  is pseudo-Lipschitzian at  $(x_0, y_0)$ . Moreover, the approximating cone  $C$  to  $\text{gph } \Omega$  exists and is given by

$$C = \{(x, y): x^T \nabla_x g_i + y^T \nabla_y g_i = 0, i = 1, \dots, q, x^T \nabla_x g_i + y^T \nabla_y g_i \leq 0, i \in I\}$$

with all gradients taken at the point  $(x_0, y_0)$  (Robinson [13, p. 504, Corollary 2]). It follows that  $\Omega$  is tangentially differentiable and  $\Sigma = D\Omega(x_0, y_0)$  is a convex process,  $\text{gph } \Sigma = C$ . Consequently, if in addition the norm is strictly convex, then  $P_\Omega$  is directionally differentiable and (3.6) follows.

## REFERENCES

1. J.-P. AUBIN, Lipschitz behaviour of solutions to convex minimization problems, *Math. Oper. Res.* **9** (1984), 87–111.
2. V. F. DEMYANOV AND A. M. RUBINOV, On quasidifferentiable mappings, *Math. Operationsforsch. Statist. Ser. Optim.* **14** (1983), 3–21.
3. A. V. FIACCO, "Introduction to Sensitivity and Stability Analysis in Nonlinear Programming," Academic Press, New York, 1983.
4. S. FITZPATRICK AND R. R. PHELPS, Differentiability of the metric projection in Hilbert space, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **270** (1982), 483–501.
5. A. HARAUX, How to differentiate the projection on a convex set in Hilbert space. Some applications to variational inequalities, *J. Math. Soc. Japan* **29** (1977), 615–631.
6. J. B. HIRIART-URRUTY, At what points is the projection mapping differentiable? *Amer. Math. Monthly* **89** (1982), 456–460.
7. R. B. HOLMES, Smoothness of certain metric projections on Hilbert space, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **184** (1973), 87–100.

8. K. JITTORNTRUM, Solution point differentiability without strict complementarity in nonlinear programming, *Math. Programming Stud.* **21** (1984), 127–138.
9. K. MALANOWSKI, Differentiability with respect to parameters of solutions to convex programming problems, *Math. Programming* **33** (1985), 352–361.
10. O. L. MANGASARIAN AND S. FROMOVITZ, The Fritz John necessary optimality conditions in the presence of equality and inequality constraints, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **17** (1967), 37–47.
11. G. P. MCCORMICK AND R. TAPIA, The gradient projection method under mild differentiability conditions, *SIAM J. Control* **10** (1972), 93–98.
12. J.-P. PENOT, On the existence of Lagrange multipliers in nonlinear programming in Banach spaces, in *Lecture Notes in Control and Information Sciences* Vol. 30, pp. 89–104, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1981.
13. S. M. ROBINSON, Stability theory for systems of inequalities, Part II: Differentiable nonlinear systems, *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.* **13** (1976), 497–513.
14. R. T. ROCKAFELLAR, “Convex Analysis,” Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, NJ, 1970.
15. R. T. ROCKAFELLAR, Lipschitzian properties of multifunctions, *Nonlinear Anal. Theory Methods Appl.* **9** (1985), 867–885.
16. A. SHAPIRO, On differentiability of metric projections in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , 1: Boundary case, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **99** (1987), 123–128.
17. E. H. ZARANTONELLO, Projections on convex sets in Hilbert space and spectral theory, in “Contributions to Nonlinear Functional Analysis,” pp. 237–424, Academic Press, New York, 1971.